

MINUTES
Advisory Committee
Public Schools Accountability Act of
1999

Department of Education Building
1325 J Street, Room 1519
Sacramento, California
January 18, 2000
1:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Holly Covin, Acting Chair; Assistant Executive Director, Policy Analysis & Research, CSBA
Eva Baker, Director, Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California at Los Angeles
Vicki Barber, El Dorado County Superintendent of Schools
Tom Boysen, Senior Vice President, Education, Milken Family Foundation
Sue Burr, Undersecretary, Office of the Secretary for Education
Leslie DeMersseman, Immediate Past President, California School Boards Association
Patsy Estrellas, Teacher, Norwalk La Mirada School District/California Teachers Association
Ed Haertel, Professor, Stanford University, School of Education
Jere Jacobs, Former Assistant Vice President, Pacific Telesis
Kelvin Lee, Superintendent, Dry Creek Joint Elementary School
Cecelia Mansfield, California State PTA
Lynette Nyaggah, Teacher, Rio Hondo College
Jeff Orlinsky, Teacher, Warren High School
Scott Plotkin, Chief Consultant and Staff Director, Senate Education Committee
Ernesto Ruiz, Director, Migrant Education, Region 2, Butte County Office of Education
Irene Sumida, Co-Director, Fenton Avenue Charter School
Rosie Thompson, Business Unit Executive, IBM Global Education
Charles Weis, Ventura County Superintendent of Schools
Lynn Wilen, Superintendent, Reef Sunset Unified School District

MEMBERS ABSENT

Carl Cohn, Co-Chair; Superintendent, Long Beach Unified School District
Pat Pineda, Co-Chair; Vice President, Legal, Environmental, and Government Affairs, NUMMI
Sam Araki, Former President, Lockheed Martin Missiles & Space
Mary Alice Callahan, President, Morgan Hill Federation of Teachers
Rudy Castruita, San Diego County Superintendent of Schools
General Davie, Jr., Superintendent, San Juan Unified School District
Bob Friedman, Chief Operations Officer, CSIS
Javier Gonzales, Teacher, Pioneer High School
Jerry Hayward, Director, Policy Analysis for California Education

Janett Humphries, President, SEIU Local 99, Los Angeles Unified School District
Sidney Morrison, Principal, Arnold Elementary School/ACSA State President
Dolores Ochoa, Parent, State Parent Advisory Board
Bill Ouchi, Vice-Dean, Anderson School, University of California at Los Angeles
Tamara Powers, Parent
Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, ESL Consultant, Los Angeles County Office of Education
Rene Townsend, Professor/Consultant, CSU San Marcos, College of Education

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION LIAISONS

Marian Bergeson (Present)
Susan Hammer (Absent)

PRINCIPAL STAFF TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Padia, Director, Office of Policy and Evaluation
Pat McCabe, Manager, Education Planning and Information Center

Call to Order. Ms. Covin called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m., in the absence of the co-chairs.

Introductions. Ms. Covin invited the members, staff, and audience to introduce themselves.

Organizational Matters. Mr. Padia briefly mentioned some organizational matters.

API Release. Mr. Padia briefed the members on the release of API information. Ms. Burr had a press conference last week. Tomorrow there will be a teleconference directed at local officials. On Thursday and Friday of this week, there will be detailed press briefings. On January 25, the full release will be made to the press and posted on the Internet. Schools were mailed out their reports last week. The greatest areas of confusion have been the decile rankings and the comparable school data. Staff have been telling the press that a ranking in deciles 5-6 is average, 7-8 is above average, and 9-10 is well above average, while 3-4 is below average; and 1-2 is well below average. Mr. Padia described the various informational materials that are available now and will be available later. Ms. Barber and Ms. Wilen noted the excellence of the materials and commended the staff.

Alternative Accountability Subcommittee. Ms. Covin invited Ms. Barber to report on the morning's work of the Alternative Accountability Subcommittee. Ms. Barber indicated that a principal topic of discussion had been clarification of the objective of the alternative accountability system. She noted that there exists a wide range of educational programs, some in which students stay for only very short periods of time. The subcommittee has determined that no ranking is really possible for some of these programs, e.g., juvenile hall schools. The subcommittee also broadly classified the programs into four groups.

- Schools with less than 100 students. This matter has been assigned to the Technical Design Group (TDG) to study options for development of an alternative API. These schools WANT a number; the question is what would be statistically valid.
- Special education schools. These schools have students with a wide range of disabilities. The subcommittee will be looking at them more closely.
- At risk student populations, including court and community schools, alternative schools, opportunity schools, continuation high schools, and independent study. The subcommittee began to look at such issues as criteria for the inclusion of students in these types of setting; options for performance indicators; indicators that are constant, versus indicators that are optional; self-selection; and other factors. Clearly the indicators need to be different depending on the schools' differing objectives.
- Alternative education charters and magnets. The subcommittee looked at the PSAA Advisory Committee's guiding principles and how they pertain to these groups of schools. We need to expand on some of these principles in order to address the needs of these schools.

The subcommittee's meeting schedule includes March 8, April 14, and May 4. Ms. Wilen commented that the subcommittee wants schools in these various groups to have the option of participating in the regular API. She also commended the staff for their fine work in preparation for the meeting.

Mr. Boysen inquired as to whether alternative accountability schools would participate in the awards programs. If so, he asked whether we are creating an expectation we can actually meet, because an alternative accountability system that would be truly comparable would probably be very expensive. Ms. Wilen reiterated that's why the subcommittee wants the option for participation in the regular API. Mr. Padia commented that we need to have the alternative accountability plan by summer.

Internet Search Presentation on API Information. Ms. Covin invited Lynn Baugher, Manager of the CDE Educational Demographics Office, to make a presentation on Internet search capabilities with regard to the API information. Mr. McCabe and Paula Wenzl, Education Planning and Information Center, contributed to the presentation, during which there was considerable informal discussion. Mr. Orlinsky asked if the displays could be adjusted such that the header information for columns stayed constant while scrolling down the rows. Ms. Baugher mentioned other information available through DataQuest.

Awards Subcommittee. Ms. Covin invited Mr. Lee to give a report on the work of the Awards Subcommittee. Mr. Lee indicated that the majority of the subcommittee's time was spent on the consideration of implementing AB 1114. We heard about a number of existing recognition programs for schools and teachers. We took note of the conflicting

time lines among these programs with respect to the API. In 1999, fourteen states had cash awards programs, and most have modified their original plans governing the money's distribution. Kentucky went from a teacher-based to a school-based awards system. We reviewed the requirements of state law. The Governor feels that at least ten percent growth should be the minimum for awards. The law excludes teachers on emergency permits as well as classified employees. The awards go to districts for schools; the actual distribution of the awards at the school is subject to negotiation with the default (in the event of impasse) being that the awards are distributed pro rata based on each certificated employee's salary. Kentucky lets local agencies decide the distribution of the awards. In part this is to insulate the state from suits.

There was considerable discussion about possible percentage levels for the distribution of award funds. It is estimated that ten percent growth level would be about yield about \$1,100 per certificated employee; fifteen percent growth would yield about \$1,900; and twenty percent would yield about \$3,400. There was considerable discussion as to the purpose of the awards. Was the intent to give small awards for many; large awards to a few; or to have a graduated scale of awards? Ethics is a key consideration. We must ensure that we do not propose an awards structure fashioned in such a way as to encourage "messing with the system" (i.e., making the stakes too high). The subcommittee is scheduled to meet next on February 15. The subcommittee had lots of discussion, but did not reach closure on any of the key issues. We are narrowing down the number of stars by which to navigate the ship, and we understand that there are definitely some rough seas ahead.

Mr. Weis inquired about the possibility of a teacher simultaneously being dismissed and receiving an award. Mr. Lee indicated that another area of concern is teachers who do not serve for the full year at a site receiving an award. He reiterated that, while guidelines may be given to districts, the awards' distribution is locally bargained. Mr. Padia reminded the group that AB 1114 awards are only for schools in the lower five deciles and that these AB 1114 awards are in addition to the funds provided by GPAP. Mr. Orlinsky asked whether interns would qualify. Ms. Burr reiterated that only certificated employees may receive award funds. Mr. Padia commented that schools must have an API to qualify for an award under AB 1114. He also noted that the State Board wants a recommendation by March, meaning that we need a document in hand by March 1. He asked if members would like to work on the matter by mail or call special meeting. Ms. Covin suggested that materials be sent out to the members who can then send in concerns or objections to staff. Mr. Haertel noted that non-subcommittee members would be welcome to attend the next subcommittee meeting if they are able to do so.

Evaluation Subcommittee. Ms. Covin invited Mr. Weis to report on the work of the Evaluation Subcommittee. Mr. Weis indicated that the subcommittee had designed a three-page presentation for the State Board to establish an RFP for a contract evaluator. The presentation consists of five parts: (1) legislative requirements, (2) definitions and acronyms, (3) a display of evaluation requirements, (4) six questions to guide the evaluation, and (5) a time line for the evaluation and report. Mr. Lee asked if the provisions of AB 1114 are outside of the evaluation. Mr. Padia indicated that they are,

but that they may be indirectly addressed in the sense of the API being the basis of the distribution of AB 1114 awards. Ms. Covin asked how the \$500,000 amount for the contract was established. Mr. Padia indicated that it was based on the historical experience of CDE with similar evaluations. Mr. Padia pointed out that the evaluation funding would not be available until July 1. Mr. Boysen commented that it is important to have "your own evaluation" of an endeavor of this type to ensure that the evaluation remains focused on essential elements of this program; the presence of other programs, e.g., Golden State Exams, can pose complications and distractions in the evaluation process.

Superintendent's Comments. Ms. Covin invited State Superintendent Delaine Eastin to address the PSAA Advisory Committee. Superintendent Eastin commented that we never could have been this far along without the benefit of the Advisory Committee's fine work. This is a very exciting system of accountability for our state. The prior work on rewards and interventions (and experiences of other states) were essential factors in developing the current system. As we proceed, we must learn from our experiences, both our successes and problems, and make appropriate adjustments. We are not in the first wave of states, but we have some of the most difficult work because of California's size and complexity. She commended all who have devoted so many hours to this effort, which will be the basis for distributing real awards and intervening where necessary. The alternative API presents challenges that we now need to address. Some don't welcome accountability; some want more resources and no accountability; some want more accountability without more resources; we must fight for both.

Mr. Weis commended CDE staff for their outstanding effort. Ms. DeMersseman commented that the Internet display will be absolutely phenomenal; it is excellent work. Mr. Boysen noted despite the excellent work, the real trouble is about to start with the release of figures. He inquired as to Superintendent Eastin's thoughts on the political future of accountability - what has to take place. Superintendent Eastin suggested that three things are needed. (1) We are competing with the private sector; we have to show that we have a strong accountability system. We must show that accountability is a fundamental part of our way of thinking. We must demonstrate we mean business to our shareholders (the public). (2) There is a higher level of resources required. Kentucky is spending about \$300 more per student than California. (3) We have to show that there are consequences for not improving student achievement in underperforming schools. We have a system of fiscal accountability. Taking over districts under that system, such as Compton, has been difficult. We have to show that we have similar resolve with regard to underperforming schools; we must be fair, have due process, and be even-handed, but we insist on improvement. Accountability has to be something that stays around. We must show that it not just something we are doing while we wait for the next thing to happen.

Mr. Weis commented on the need to build district-level support for schools in order to facilitate improvement. Superintendent Eastin agreed that a strong system of district-level support is essential. Mr. Jacobs commented that the state needs to think about freeing up flow of funds, having fewer categoricals, creating more flexibility in the use of funds. Superintendent Eastin responded that we all have a role to play; it is not realistic to think

in terms of abandoning all state-level constraints on funding, but we do need to start people thinking outside the box. Senator Alpert has been focused on categorical reform for some years. When we get all the stakeholders together, there's really nothing we can't do. Ms. Burr noted that the waiver process offers a way for local agencies to seek relief from funding constraints with respect to many categorical programs.

Other Issues. Mr. Weis reminded the group about tomorrow's teleconference. Geno Flores, representing Mr. Cohn, reminded the group that any concerns regarding the API figures should be brought to the attention of CDE staff.

Adjournment. Ms. Covin adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Greg Geeting

Recording Secretary